

COUNTY OF YORK

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 6, 2003 (BOS Mtg. 2/18/03)

TO: York County Board of Supervisors

FROM: James O. McReynolds, County Administrator

SUBJECT: Six-Year Secondary Road Improvement Program—FY2003-04 through FY2008-09

Issue

Every year the Board of Supervisors must review and adopt a priority listing for the use of the secondary road improvement funds projected to be allocated to York County over the next six years and a construction budget for the first year of the program (FY2003/04). The Code of Virginia requires that public comment be solicited through a duly advertised public hearing jointly conducted by the Board of Supervisors and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). Following the public hearing, the Board recommends a priority listing to VDOT. The Board will be conducting a work session on February 11th to discuss potential projects with Mr. Steven Hicks, VDOT Resident Engineer, and to provide its guidance and direction to staff. The required public hearing has been scheduled for February 18th as a follow-up to that work session. Subsequently, staff and Mr. Hicks will review any comments received at the public hearing and direction provided by the Board and prepare the formal plan adoption resolution for the Board's consideration at the March 4, 2003 meeting.

The proposed projects and priorities presented in this memorandum have been developed for consideration as a result of discussions between VDOT and County staff. They are, of course, subject to change based on discussion and direction from the Board at the February 11th work session or after the February 18th public hearing.

Considerations

1. The six-year funding window allows projects to be prioritized such that engineering and right-of-way acquisition can proceed in advance of construction funding. In this manner, projects move through the program in a logical pattern that accommodates the often long lead times necessary to undertake significant improvements. Attachment 1 lists the projects that have been included on the Six-Year Secondary Plan between 1991 and 2003.
2. As the Board will recall, last year VDOT found it necessary to significantly reduce the allocations for Secondary System projects. Those reductions were outlined in the materials distributed for the August 13, 2002 work session and the reduced amounts, as shown in the following table, have carried through to this year's program and are the

basis for the Six-Year Plan prepared for the Board's consideration. The allocation amounts for the six years of the current plan are shown in the following table:

Fiscal Year	Previously Projected Allocations (prior to 2002)	Current Projected Allocations	Difference
2003-04	\$2,445,698	\$1,718,728	(\$762,970)
2004-05	\$2,546,196	\$1,648,890	(\$897,306)
2005-06	\$2,663,772	\$1,627,463	(\$1,036,309)
2006-07	\$2,663,772	\$1,630,972	(\$1,032,800)
2007-08	\$2,663,772	\$1,629,700	(\$1,034,072)
2008-09		\$1,629,700	
TOTAL		\$9,885,453	

In addition to the reductions in total anticipated funding allocations, VDOT re-calculated the cost estimates for many of the projects listed in the Six-Year Plan. The revised cost estimates are shown on the attached summary chart (Attachment 2) and, as can be seen, are quite significant for many of the projects. In combination, the reductions in allocations and the increased cost estimates necessitate a significant reduction in the scope of the County's Secondary Six-Year Plan.

3. The program proposed for consideration represents essentially the same list of priorities as previously adopted by the Board of Supervisors (see *Current* and *Proposed* columns of Attachment 2 - Comparison and Status Summary) except that several of the lower-ranked projects would be dropped from the plan since no funding can be allocated to them.

The most current estimated cost of each project is shown in the *Revised Cost Estimate* column of the chart. Note that for some of the projects there is no construction cost estimate since the project scoping/preliminary engineering phases have not progressed far enough to generate an estimate with any reliability. Also shown is the amount of *Previous Funding* applied to the project, the *Proposed 2003-04 Allocation* (i.e., the current "budget" year), the amount of *Additional Funding Required* in future years, the *Previous Schedule* and the *Revised Schedule/Status*. VDOT's proposed allocation plan for future years of the six-year program can be reviewed in Attachment 3. These "out-year" projections are, of course, subject to change as more detailed project cost information becomes available through the on-going preliminary engineering processes for the various projects, or if funding from supplementary sources (e.g., Revenue Sharing Program, etc.) is made available.

4. The major highlights of the proposed Six-Year Plan are as follows:

- ? Priority Nos. 1 through 9 would remain unchanged and funding would be allocated in sufficient amounts to bring the projects to construction as fast as

possible and, for the most part, in the order in which listed. Accordingly, the Lakeside Drive and Big Bethel Road projects (Nos. 1 and 3) are to be allocated \$800,000 and \$389,728, respectively, in FY 2003-04. The Lakeside Drive project is currently in the preliminary engineering phase and VDOT is working to prepare plans for presentation at a public hearing tentatively scheduled for this Spring. The plans are being prepared to show a curb and gutter cross-section since that will help to minimize the amount of right-of-way acquisition and project encroachment on existing yards along Lakeside Drive. The schedules for both of these projects have been impacted by the escalating project cost estimates.

- ? Although listed on the Secondary Roads Six-Year Plan, funding for the Fort Eustis Boulevard extension project is from Regional Surface transportation Program (RSTP) and Revenue Sharing funds. As requested by the Board, VDOT agrees that priority should be given to the segment between Route 17 and Old York-Hampton Highway and has agreed to redefine the project scope as such. A project coordination meeting is scheduled for the week of February 10th and the Williamsburg Residency remains hopeful that the 2004 construction advertisement date can be maintained. (see attached letter dated February 5, 2003 from Steven Hicks, Resident Engineer).
- ? The Penniman Road project (Priority #5) is moving through the preliminary engineering phase and a public hearing to allow review and discussion of the project plans will be scheduled by VDOT in the near future. The schedule for this project has also been significantly impacted by the cost estimate escalation.
- ? The Cary's Chapel Road project (Priority #6) design has been completed and utility relocation has been accomplished. This project has been identified as a candidate for the list of ten regional congestion mitigation projects being developed by the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission in response to the Governor's initiative (for projects of less than \$2 million each that can be completed within 12 months). There are over 100 projects on the "candidates" list being evaluated; however, both VDOT and County staff remain hopeful that this project may be included on the list of ten recommended projects. Approval would not only advance its construction schedule, but it would also free up a significant amount of Secondary System funds for allocation to the County's other priorities.
- ? Preliminary scoping continues on the Water Country Parkway project (Priority #7) and a determination is pending as to the status of the rail line (to Cheatham Annex) that has an impact on the ultimate project design and how it intersects with Penniman Road. Once this issue is resolved, preliminary engineering work will be able to proceed. To date, this project has been funded exclusively with Revenue Sharing funds. Given its potential importance in opening this area to

additional economic development, future Revenue Sharing fund allocations may be warranted and desirable. However, such allocations are unnecessary until the engineering/design process has moved further along. Construction funding from Secondary System allocations is shown in the proposed plan in the out-years (2007-2009); additional Revenue Sharing allocations could free up some of those Secondary System funds for allocation to other projects.

- ? The Grafton Drive/Burts Road connection (listed as Priority Nos. 8 and 9) is in the preliminary scoping stage and will require significantly more investigation and conceptual design work before VDOT can prepare a reliable construction cost estimate. This preliminary work will be able to continue with the funding already allocated to the projects. Construction funding is not proposed within the six years covered by this plan and that, undoubtedly, will be a source of concern to the residents of Rainbrook Villas who are anxiously awaiting this improvement (see attached letter dated March 26, 2002 from Mr. Wiggins to Joseph Haggerty concerning Rainbrook petition). However, as noted in Mr. Wiggin's letter, the significant cuts in the Secondary allocations have impacted all of the Board's priority projects.
- ? Yorkville Road (proposed Priority #10) is another project where it is impossible to assign a reliable cost estimate until some project scoping work can occur. However, this is one of the projects that Mr. Hicks has identified as a candidate for treatment as a "maintenance" project, rather than a full-scale/full-design project. Mr. Hicks will be able to better explain this approach than I, but essentially it offers an opportunity to address the basic problem (in this case the 90-degree, difficult visibility curve) without having to design the project to meet all current standards. Addressing the problem in this manner could save both time and money and over the next several months staff and Mr. Hicks will be working together to further investigate this possibility.
- ? Yorktown Road and Seaford Road, formerly listed as Priority Nos. 12 and 13, are also candidates for accomplishment as "maintenance" projects and, as noted on page 1 of Attachment 2, Mr. Hicks is proposing to establish a portion of Seaford Road (between Ellerson Court and Sommerville Way) as a budget item in the amount of \$350,000 for FY2003/04 to be accomplished as a "maintenance" project that would include work on the roadside ditches, widening/paving of the shoulders, and a complete pavement overlay. This approach would be considerably less expensive than a complete reconstruction of Seaford Road to meet all current design standards and it would provide a noticeable and beneficial incremental improvement. Mr. Hicks believes that this same approach could be taken in future years with other projects (e.g., Yorktown Road, Allen's Mill Road, Burts Road and others) if the Board so desires. It should be noted that Seaford Road was selected as a test for this approach ahead of Yorktown Road because its traffic volumes are greater, it has a slightly narrower pavement width,

and its current pavement and ditch conditions are worse.

- ? An additional allocation of \$9,000 is needed to complete the 20% local match requirement for the Waller Mill Rail-Trail Bikeway project that is now under construction between Mooretown Road and Waller Mill Park (listed as Priority #11). This will complete the funding for this project, \$220,000 of which has been funded by a regional CMAQ program grant.

5. In summary, the allocations proposed for consideration for FY2003-04 are as follows:

Project	Budgeted Amount -2003/04
Total Countywide Allocation for incidentals (culverts, etc.)	\$170,000
Seaford Road – ditches/shoulders/pavement (maintenance)	\$350,000
Lakeside Drive	\$800,000
Big Bethel Road Intersections	\$389,728
Waller Mill Rail/Trail Bikeway	<u>\$9,000</u>
TOTAL	\$1,718,728

6. It should be noted that missing from the list of projects are several needs that the Board has discussed and identified over the past year. While not listed on the Secondary Plan, they have been investigated and, where possible, are being addressed in other ways. These include:

- ? The intersection of Dogwood Road and Route 238 – The very narrow pavement section on Dogwood Road at this intersection has been identified as a deficiency by Mr. Hicks and he is in the process of scheduling a “maintenance” project to widen the pavement on Dogwood and to provide a paved shoulder taper on Route 238.
- ? The entire length of Dogwood has been mentioned as a concern given its narrow cross-section and the new development activity occurring near its end. County and VDOT staff have recently conferred on this issue and the current consensus is that while improvements would be desirable, there are other higher-volume, higher priority road segments that should be addressed first.
- ? Mansion Road is another very narrow roadway (13-foot pavement width) on which new development activity is occurring. County and VDOT staff have worked with the developers of the two residential projects that will access Mansion Road and a plan has been developed to upgrade its pavement width to 18 feet. This plan will include a forthcoming request that the Board of

Supervisors authorize a small Revenue Sharing Program contribution (\$6,000) to help fund the cost of the pavement overlay.

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission has previously found all of these projects to be fully in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan, as required by the Code of Virginia.

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S RECOMMENDATION

I believe that the Six Year Plan proposal developed by the Resident Engineer and staff represents a good approach to keeping the County's Secondary System improvement priorities on-track in the face of reduced allocations and escalating costs. I am particularly impressed with Mr. Hick's initiative to identify the "maintenance" project approach as a way of addressing in a more timely and cost-effective manner some of the County's improvement needs. Staff stands ready to provide any additional details that the Board may desire based on its discussions or on any comments received at the public hearing. Subject to those comments and direction by the Board, we will prepare a resolution for your formal consideration at the March 4th meeting.

Carter/3337

Attachments

- ? Summary Listing of Projects (1991 to 2003)
- ? Six-Year Secondary Road Construction Plan – Current and Proposed Comparison and Status Summary
- ? Secondary Six-Year Plan Allocations Table prepared by VDOT
- ? February 5, 2003 letter regarding Fort Eustis Boulevard extension
- ? March 26, 2002 letter to Joseph Haggerty regarding Burts Road/Grafton Drive

Copy to: Steven Hicks, Resident Engineer, Virginia Department of Transportation